

To: Dr. Linda Birnbaum[birnbaum@niehs.nih.gov];
bucher@niehs.nih.gov[bucher@niehs.nih.gov]; Burke, Thomas[Burke.Thomas@epa.gov]; Sinks,
Tom[Sinks.Tom@epa.gov]
From: Chris Portier
Sent: Fri 11/27/2015 12:22:36 PM
Subject: Fwd: EFSA Glyphosate Recommendations
[EFSA-Glyphosate-Letter.pdf](#)
[ATT00001.htm](#)

FYI. This went out this morning and is embargoed for public release until 0:00 CET on Monday.
C.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Chris Portier <cportier@me.com>
Date: November 27, 2015 at 10:25:35 AM GMT+1
To: Andreas rummel <ak.rummel@t-online.de>, "Sass, Jennifer" <jsass@nrdc.org>, Angeliki Lysimachou <angeliki@pan-europe.info>, Meg Sears <meg@preventcancer.org>, Ann Doherty <amsterdamfarmer@xs4all.nl>, Martin Pigeon <martin@corporateeurope.org>, Stéphane Foucart <foucart@lemonde.fr>, Danny Hakim <hakim@nytimes.com>
Subject: EFSA Glyphosate Recommendations

Dear Addressees,

You have expressed an interest in opinions I or my colleagues might wish to express concerning the recent European Food Safety Agency (EFSA) decision that the widely used herbicide, glyphosate "is unlikely to pose a carcinogenic hazard to humans." Attached to this email is an open letter from 96 prominent epidemiologists, toxicologists, statisticians and molecular biologists from 25 countries. We have banded together and written a joint criticism of aspects of the EFSA review. Public release of this letter is **EMBARGOED!**

Please do not release this letter before 0:00 CET, Monday 30 November, 2015. I will be happy to answer any questions you may have about the content of this letter; my contact information is on the letter. For those of you wishing to prepare newspaper articles or web articles on this letter and/or this issue, I have prepared three quotes from me that you are welcome to use. These are below.

Sincerely,

Prof. Christopher J. Portier

QUOTES:

“My reason for doing all of this work is quite simple, it does the science of risk assessment a disservice when carefully developed methods for analyzing and interpreting the evidence are put aside in favor of ad-hoc approaches that are either wrong, or not amenable to scrutiny by the broader scientific community.

For science to be effective in guiding public health decisions, there needs to be clarity, rigor, transparency, and common sense . The EFSA assessment has serious deficits in all of these areas.

Most importantly, to blindly assess the safety of pure glyphosate to which few people are exposed without considering the evidence on the glyphosate formulations that people are really exposed to is both scientifically flawed and makes little sense to the public.”